

Message

From: Seow, Jimmy [Jimmy.Seow@DER.wa.gov.au]
Sent: 11/2/2015 6:04:28 AM
To: Donohue, Joyce [Donohue.Joyce@epa.gov]
CC: Krasnic, Toni [krasnic.toni@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Provisional Drinking water values PFOS PFOA
Attachments: ATSDR Fact sheet Aug 2015.pdf

Dear Dr Donohue

How are you

Thanks for your reply and Tucker et al paper which is much appreciated.

May I bother you again to find out whether there is a time frame for the release of the new values for PFOS and PFOA drinking water values. You may like to know we in Australia are awaiting to know with much interest and anticipation.

I went to check ATSDR as suggested by you but the ATSDR fact sheet and Public Health Statement still quote the USEPA provisional values. I presume they will revise it upon finalisation of the USEPA revision report.

If not asking too much is it possible to know the new PFOS and PFOA values even though it is interim to be confirmed for us to use a guidance in Australia.

The critical values I know so far that can influence us are:

PFOS

Lowest is the Dutch for freshwater at 0.00065 ug/L as screening value - very low

Next is Sweden at 0.09 ug/L

If the US reduces its drinking value 100 fold it will be at 0.002 ug/L

PFOA

Lowest is from New Jersey at 0.04 ug/L

Next is Sweden at 0.09 ug/L

If the US reduces its drinking value 100 fold it will be at 0.004 ug/L

Does the revised USEPA drinking water values also addressed PFHXS, PFBA, PFBS and fluorotelomers.

We are encountering more and more sites contaminated with PFC resulting from legacy use of firefighting foams with PFOS and PFOA.

Thanks

Dr Jimmy Seow
Manager Pollution Response
Compliance and Enforcement
Department of Environment Regulation
Adjunct Assoc Professor Curtin University WA
DER Postal address:
Locked Bag 33
Cloister Square
Perth
Western Australia 6850
Work Location address:
Level 4, The Atrium
168 St Georges Tce
Perth WA 6000
Direct phone +61 8 6467 5039
Mobile + 61 400 866 421
Email jimmy.seow@der.wa.gov.au
w: www.der.wa.gov.au

-----Original Message-----

From: Donohue, Joyce [mailto:Donohue.Joyce@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, 15 October 2015 8:23 PM
To: Seow, Jimmy
Subject: RE: Provisional Drinking water values PFOS PFOA

Dear Jimmy:

It is too soon to say what the new EPA values will be. I believe I responded to you before and told you that we had not finished the update to PFOA and that my manager was reviewing the post peer review draft for PFOS. I now have her comments on PFOS but have not met with her to discuss them. We are still finalizing the PFOA post peer review draft for her review but are closer to being finished when last I wrote.

Are you aware, that ATSDR has released their assessment for additional comment? You can probably find that on line to look at their values. That might help you with your meeting.

You may well be correct regarding the estimate of a hundred fold difference originating from the Grandjean and Clapp, 2015 paper wherein the focus was the results from the Macon et al., 2011 paper and the Grandjean et al., 2012 publication. Both papers are in our document and have been considered in our assessment. However, I have to wait until our findings are reviewed by management before making any statement regarding their impact on the quantitative assessment. In case you are not aware, there is a new mammary gland paper. I have attached it to this e-mail in case you do not have it.

Joyce M. Donohue, Ph.D.
Health and Ecological Criteria Division
Office of Science and Technology
Office of Water

-----Original Message-----

From: Seow, Jimmy [mailto:Jimmy.Seow@DER.wa.gov.au]
Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2015 2:47 AM
To: Donohue, Joyce
Cc: Krasnic, Toni
Subject: Provisional Drinking water values PFOS PFOA

Dear Dr Donohue

How are you.

Toni Krasnic at the USEPA referred me to you regarding the above matter.

I emailed you 2 weeks ago enquiring the status of the review of the above by a panel of toxicologists in 2014

Recently I heard rumours from my contacts in the U.S. and also Sweden that the provisional values could be lowered 100 fold. Could you kindly confirm or clarify. Your advice is most useful as in Australia we have to choose one as we now have several sites contaminated with PFOS and PFOA causing much health concerns to the community.

I was wondering that rumour could be caused by the recent paper by Grandjean and Clapp 2015 whereby they stated that they believe the provisional values are 100 fold too high.

If you can get back to me as soon as possible as I am having a meeting with several state regulators in our state of Victoria much affected by the above PFC issue.

I am now aware of the current court cases involving 3M and DuPont in the U.S. Am sure you know about the case on Ohio whereby a plaintiff was awarded US\$1.6 m for her kidney cancer drinking water contaminated with PFOA.

Really appreciate your clarification and thinking.

Warmest regards.

Assoc Prof Dr Jimmy Seow
Manager pollution Response
Department of Environment Regulation
Perth WA Australia
+6140086621
Sent from my iPhone